IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION No 1094 of 1989

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B.MAJMUDAR

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

NANUBHAI KANJIBHAI

Versus

RUKSHAMANIBEN, WD/O MOHANLAL MODI

Appearance:

MR SV RAJU for the Petitioner.

DELETED for Respondent No. 1

MR SK BUKHARI for Respondent No. 2,4-7

RULE SERVED for Respondent No. 3

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B.MAJMUDAR

Date of decision: 29/01/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Mr.Raju, learned Advocate for the petitioner, is not present. Heard Mr.Bukhari for respondents 2, 4 and

7.

Mr.Bukhari, learned Advocate, who is appearing for respondents 2, 4 and 7, states that the parties have settled their dispute and the petitioner has already handed over possession to the original landlord. He submitted that he has also written a letter to Mr.S.V. Raju, learned Advocate for the petitioner. Copy of the said letter is kept on record. Since the learned Advocate is making a statement that the parties have settled their dispute and the petitioner has already handed over possession to the original landlord, in my view, now, nothing further is required to be done in this matter.

This C.R.A. is accordingly dismissed as having become infructuous, since the possession is handed over, as per the say of Mr.Bukhari. Rule is discharged. Interim relief stands vacated. No costs.

Liberty to apply in case of difficulty.

Copy of the letter written by Mr.Bukhari to Mr.Raju is taken on record.

29th January, 2004 (P.B. Majmudar, J.)

****

(apj)